



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

One most interesting passage, quoted by Duval at length, is worth transcribing here also :

What profit had the Athenians from the murder of Socrates, which was required to them by famine and pest; or the Samians from the burning of Pythagoras, as their whole country in one moment was covered with sand; or the Jews from the putting to death of their wise king, as from that time the kingdom was taken from them? With justice God took vengeance for these three wise men: the Athenians died of hunger; the Samians were covered by the sea; the Jews were murdered and driven from their kingdom, and live everywhere in dispersion. Socrates is not dead, because of Plato; nor Pythagoras, because of the statue of Hera; nor that wise king, because of the new laws which he has given. [Duval is wrong in translating the first sentence about Jesus: *leur sage roi, qui les avait gouvernés pendant quelque temps.*]

There is plenty of opportunity for original and fruitful research in this field of studies; and this survey of what has been done already is very convenient. May it stimulate work on the American side of the Atlantic, where scholars like Perkins and Isaac H. Hall—to mention only those who are dead—have done so good work.

EB. NESTLE.

MAULBRONN, GERMANY.

DIE GRIECHISCHEN CHRISTLICHEN SCHRIFTSTELLER DER ERSTEN DREI JAHRHUNDERTE, herausgegeben von der Kirchenväter-Commission der königl. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften. *Origenes' Werke*, I. Band: Die Schrift vom Martyrium; Buch I–IV Gegen Celsus; II. Band: Buch V–VIII Gegen Celsus; Die Schrift vom Gebet. Herausg. von DR. PAUL KOETSCHAU. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1899. Pp. xcii + 374; viii + 545. M. 28.

THE Berlin edition of the Greek Fathers of the first three centuries, so auspiciously inaugurated by Bonwetsch and Achelis with their edition of the works of Hippolytus,¹ is worthily continued by the present edition of three treatises of Origen in two volumes.

The contents of these two volumes are as follows: (1) introduction (pp. i–xcii), and (2) the Greek text of the three writings of Origen: the “Exhortation to Martyrdom” (pp. 1–47), the “Eight Books against Celsus” (pp. 49–344; and Vol. II, pp. 1–293), and the “Treatise on Prayer” (Vol. II, pp. 295–403); followed by copious indices (pp. 407–538), additions and corrections (pp. 539–45).

¹ See the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY, Vol. II, No. 4, pp. 901–4.

The editor, a professor in the Grossherzogliche Gymnasium at Jena, has been known for years as a close student of Origen by his contributions to the *Texte und Untersuchungen*, and other periodicals.² The two volumes before us are the fruits of fifteen years of work and may be called the first critical edition of these three treatises.

The introduction, of ninety-two pages, discusses for each of the three works all the historical, literary, and doctrinal questions, as well as those of textual tradition and criticism.

The "Exhortation to Martyrdom" was written 235 A. D.,³ at Cæsarea, and is written for the purpose of encouraging, not so much the two men to whom it is addressed,⁴ as the whole body of faithful Christian believers suffering under the persecutions begun by Emperor Maximin. Many had become lax; many had considered the names of the gods nothing but empty titles, to whom to sacrifice was not a heinous crime. But these Origen does not address. The exhortation is written in the form of a homily.

The *editio princeps* of the *Exhortatio*, by Wetstein (1674), and the later one by Delarue (1733) are both based upon a single, incomplete, sixteenth-century MS. (Basiliensis, 31). Koetschau bases his edition upon the Codex Venetus Marcianus 45 (fourteenth century, = *M*) and the Parisinus suppl. graec. 616 (1339 A. D., = *P*); the former containing also annotations by Cardinal Bessarion. The two MSS. belong to the same family, the former presenting a complete and more correct text, the other being rather fragmentary, but yet by far superior to Cod. Basiliensis; both go back to the same Vatican codex (386, thirteenth century), which is the basis of all the Celsus MSS. If so, this latter must have been mutilated before the end of the fourteenth century, for the *Exhortatio* is not found in that codex as we know it.

²"Die Textüberlieferung der Bücher des Origenes gegen Celsus in den Handschriften dieses Werkes und der Philokalia." Prolegomena zu einer kritischen Ausgabe. *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Vol. VI, No. 1 (1889), pp. vi + 156. See J. A. ROBINSON, in *Journal of Philology*, Vol. XVIII (1890), pp. 288-96.—"Die Gliederung des ἀληθῆς λόγος des Celsus," in *Jahrb. für Protest. Theologie*, Vol. XVIII (1892), pp. 604-32.—*Des Gregorios Thaumaturgos Dankrede an Origenes*; als Anhang: Der Brief des Origenes an Gregorios Thaumaturgos (Heft 9 of G. KRÜGER's "Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengeschichtlicher Quellschriften").—Also many reviews of books dealing with Origen's works.

³The editor follows here his friend, Professor K. J. Neumann, the well-known author of *Der römische Staat und die allgemeine Kirche bis auf Diocletian* (Leipzig).

⁴The presbyter Protocletus and the deacon Ambrose, both members of the church at Cæsarea.

The "Eight Books against Celsus" were written, at Cæsarea, during the reign of Philip the Arabian (Eusebius, *Ch. Hist.*, VI, 36, 2); more precisely, in 248 A. D.,⁵ when Origen was sixty years of age. In this same year the millennium of the Roman empire was celebrated, and this fact contributed much toward strengthening the feeling of self-sufficiency among the pagan nations, thus endangering the progress of Christianity. To strengthen the wavering believers Origen acceded to the long and often expressed wish of his friend Ambrose and wrote this apology as an answer to the attack made by Celsus. It is by far the largest and most influential apology and was read very widely. Koetschau describes on pp. xxiv–xlvi Origen's intimate knowledge of Greek literature and Greek antiquities;⁶ follows this up with a chapter on the church father's familiarity with the Bible and with Christian literature; states his attitude toward Greek philosophy; defines his theological system; and gives an analysis of the eight books, and a short presentation of the contents of Celsus' Ἀληθὺς Λόγος.⁷

Of great interest is the chapter on the text-transmission of the "Contra Celsum" (pp. lvii–lxxv). In *Texte und Untersuchungen* (*loc. cit.*; see footnote 2), pp. 63 f., Koetschau maintained the coördinate authority of the two MSS., viz., Cod. Vatic. graec. 386 (=A) and Cod. Parisinus suppl. graec. 616 (=P); but J. Armitage Robinson, the editor of the "Philocalia" (1893), and Neumann soon convinced him that Cod. P was only a copy of A, just as the Venetus 45 (sixteenth century) and Venetus 44 (fifteenth century). In addition to these there is the text of the "Philocalia" (Φ), which reproduces about one-seventh of "Contra Celsum." We have thus two sources for our text, A (direct) and Φ (secondary). The former is given the preference by Koetschau in the establishment of the text.⁸

⁵ Also here following the suggestion of Neumann, who, taking into account an allusion of Origen (iii, 15) to an actual revolution, refers this to that of the three counter-emperors Iotapianus, Pacatianus, and Uranius Antoninus.

⁶ A knowledge equaled only by his great teacher, Clement of Alexandria, as shown in the latter's Στρωματεῖς.

⁷ As constituted by Koetschau in his review of PATRICK, *The Apology of Origen in Reply to Celsus*, in the *Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1893, No. 18.—Concerning pp. xxiv–xlvi of Koetschau's preface we agree with van Manen, Jülicher, and others, that they belong not here, but into a general introduction to a complete edition of Origen's works.

⁸ The "Philocalia," as is well known, was compiled in the fourth century by Basil and Gregory Nazianzen, reëdited in the sixth century with a new prologue, and has undergone undoubtedly many changes, intentional as well as accidental.—For the further study of the text of "Contra Celsum," Jülicher's remarks, *Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1899, No. 20 (especially cols. 559, 560), are very instructive and welcome:

The edition of "Contra Celsum" has called forth a very unpleasant controversy between the present editor and Paul Wendland, the well-known editor of the works of Philo. In a review, written in the most exasperating and provoking tone and manner, and published in the *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1899, No. 4, pp. 276-304, Wendland denies to the present edition all merit and condemns it *in toto*. He finds that Koetschau undervalues Φ and gives undue preference to *A*; he quotes a number of passages in proof of his assertion; maintains, in other cases, the editor's inaptness for sound philological criticism; gives a third list in which emendations almost self-evident have been omitted out of sheer ignorance; and continues to find fault with every feature of Koetschau's edition. Wendland's language is very severe, and, in many cases, unjustified and uncalled for. As was to be expected, Koetschau answered Wendland's attack⁹ and endeavored to answer every objection raised by his critic against his own method and position. It must be deplored that Koetschau assumes against his critic the same tone and manner which have been so unanimously condemned in Wendland. It cannot be denied that, in a good many instances, Wendland's emendations are more acceptable than Koetschau admits, and we look forward with great expectations to the book promised by Wendland, in which he will take up all the passages in Origen's work believed by him to be corrupted and faulty. Whatever Wendland may have proved in his review, or may show in his forthcoming book, it cannot be said that Koetschau has been derelict in his work or that he has given us an edition full of errors and mistakes. Many of the objections of Wendland's concern only small minutiae, and by no means detract from the value of the edition. Wendland's rejoinder in "Koetschau's Bemerkungen zu meiner Ausgabe von Origenes' Exhortatio" in the *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1899, No. 8 (August), is not likely to end the feud between the two scholars.¹⁰

"Bei der Textconstitution hat Koetschau am seltensten zu einer unnöthigen Conjectur gegriffen, meistens leuchten seine Emendationsvorschläge ohne Weiteres ein." — In the present edition every word attributed to Celsus is printed in larger type, thus making it easy to recognize at once Celsus' own words.

⁹ *Kritische Bemerkungen zu meiner Ausgabe von Origenes' Exhortatio, Contra Celsum, de oratione*. Entgegnung auf die von Paul Wendland veröffentlichte Kritik. Von PAUL KOETSCHAU. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1889. Pp. 82. M. 1.60.

¹⁰ It is interesting to note that almost all the reviewers warmly defend Koetschau against the attack of Wendland; so, e. g., G. Krüger in *Liter. Centralblatt*, 1899, No. 39; Jülicher in *Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1899, No. 20; Erwin Preuschen in *Berliner*

The present edition marks a long and notable advance upon the *editio princeps* of Hoeschel (Augsburg, 1605), based on two copies from Cod. Venetus 45 (= *M*) and one from Cod. Venetus 44 (fifteenth century, = *V*); and upon the Benedictine edition of Delarue (Paris, 1733), based on two copies from *P* and one from *M*. Delarue's text was copied by Migne and Lommatzsch.

The treatise "On Prayer" is based upon a MS. of Trinity College, Cambridge (*B* 8, 10, of fourteenth century), which Mr. Charles J. B. Gaskoin had collated for this purpose. The archetype of the codex must have been very close to the original draft of the work, which was made in Cæsarea (in Palestine) some time during the years 233 and 234 A. D.¹¹ Koetschau, of course, consulted the *editio princeps* (Cambridge, 1686), which was copied by Wetstein (Basle, 1694), and this again by Delarue. Due regard is paid also throughout to the edition of William Reading (London, 1728).

In the "Contra Celsum" we admire Origen's learning; the two other tracts reveal unto us his innermost religious life and fervor. It is evident to every reader of the three treatises that they were written rapidly for specific purposes at the request of his friend Ambrose. Pp. xci f. of the present edition contain a list of the abbreviations for MSS. and editions used by the editor. Special attention should be called here to the careful indices, which make the use of the two volumes quite easy. The "index of passages"—covering thirty pages—contains references to every Old Testament book except Ezra, Nehemiah, and Obadiah, and to every New Testament book except 2 and 3 John, and Philemon. Of classical literature, we find references to some eighty Greek and Latin authors; and more than forty early Christian writers (including Josephus, Philo, and Enoch) are registered. The only objection against this copious index is that the editor has massed together references to text and to his commentary. The second index, containing proper names, covers twelve pages (439–50). This is followed by a *Sachregister*, of eighty-seven pages, presenting an almost complete lexicon to these three works of Origen.¹² It includes many words which should be treated in an *index verborum*, sadly missed in this edition of Origen's works.

philologische Wochenschrift, 1899, Nos. 39, 40 (though agreeing with Wendland on the preference of Φ to *A*); Bratke in *Theol. Literaturblatt*, 1899, Nos. 48, 49; and Paul Legay in *Revue critique*, 1899, November 13.

¹¹ See, however, PIERRE BATIFFOL in *Revue biblique*, January, 1900, pp. 123, 124.

¹² Some omissions are mentioned by Jülicher and others.

Seven pages of "Additions and Corrections" (pp. 539-45) are a new proof of the tireless industry and care of the editor.

The two volumes, as a whole, register a distinct advance on all that has preceded them in the presentation of Origen's works. Students now possess an edition which, without being perfect, is critical in the best sense of the word. The typography is all that could be expected; paper and press-work might be much better. The whole enterprise, however, is an honor to German scholarship and erudition.

W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

TESTAMENTUM DOMINI NOSTRI JESU CHRISTI nunc primum edidit, latine reddidit et illustravit IGNATIUS EPHRAEM II. RAHMANI, Patriarcha Antiochenus Syrorum. Moguntiae sumptibus Francisci Kirchheim 1899. Pp. lii + 231. M. 25.

THE publication of this volume has already given rise to a whole library of articles. Compare Achelis in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1899, No. 26; Batiffol in *Bulletin de Littérature ecclésiastique*, February 20, 1900; *Revue biblique*, April, 1900, pp. 253-60; Baumstark in *Römische Quartalschrift*, 1900, pp. 1-45; Funk in *Der Katholik*, January, 1900; *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 1900, p. 2; Harnack in *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1899; Kent in *Dublin Review*, April, 1900; G. Morin in *Revue bénédictine*, January and July, 1900; Wordsworth in *Revue internationale de Théologie*, July-September; Zahn in *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 11, pp. 438-50. The publication was announced by the German publisher in a way which is, I am glad to say, not common for learned publications, and our daily papers have taken up the matter, as if there were to be found in it a new revelation of Christ himself. The oriental editor, too, was not mindful of the golden rule, given by one of our great philological critics to all scholars who have the good fortune to find a codex or are engaged with such a thing: "*Do not overrate your codex.*" Nevertheless this codex and the matter contained in it are of great interest. It already appears that the codex, though it is very late, having been written A. D. 1154, is unique in two respects. Its writer aimed to give a complete Bible of the Old and New Testaments,¹ counting the books from 1 to 76, a numbering which does not seem to be found anywhere else, and it is a

¹ *Continet codex ab initio ad folium 338 versum . . . omnes V. et N. T. tum proto-canonicos tum deuterio-canonicos libros, qui attingunt summam septuaginta sex . . .*